

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated May 30, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on August 30, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1-30 remain pending following entry of this response. Claim 28 has been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Objections

Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "more" should be inserted on line 9 of claim 28 (page 6).

Claim 28 has been amended as indicated by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants submit, however, that these claims are directed to statutory subject matter. Each of the claims provides a concrete and useful result. In fact, each of the claims provides an interface to a user allowing the user to view annotations. Providing such an interface involves the physical manipulation of a display, which is clearly a concrete and tangible result.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-15 and 17-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Rivette et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,877,137, hereinafter, "*Rivette*").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Rivette* fails to teach each and every element of the claim. For example, regarding claim 3, which has been incorporated by amendment into claim 1, Examiner states that *Rivette* teaches "annotations are viewed by selecting a linking button in a web page with another application." Applicants concede that the cited passage deals with viewing annotations in a secondary application, however, that secondary application is one with the sole purpose of allowing the user to view the annotation which has been linked to a single type of application: a Web page. In contrast, in the claimed invention, the annotations are viewed from a separate interface. The secondary application is a separate kind of application, different from the first, in which a data element may be found where an annotation is linked. Therefore, Applicants submit claim 1 and its dependents are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Regarding claim 13, which has been incorporated by amendment into claim 12, Examiner states that *Rivette* teaches that annotations may be viewed from a secondary web application. *Rivette* says in column 18, lines 34-42:

A note or sub-note may be linked to all or any portion of a Web page. (In the discussion contained herein, attributes of sub-notes also apply to notes.) Multiple sub-notes may be linked to portions of the same Web page. This is true, whether the sub-notes are in the same or different notes. These Web page portions may be completely overlapping, partially overlapping, or non-overlapping. Also, the sub-notes in a note may be linked to portions of a single Web page, or to portions of one or more Web pages.

In contrast, the claimed invention allows for annotations to be viewed in a secondary type of application. They do not have to be the same, as in *Rivette*, where both applications must be web pages. Therefore, Applicants submit claim 12 and its dependents are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Regarding claim 25, Examiner argues that *Rivette* teaches that sub-notes may be associated with multiple applications. *Rivette* says in column 19, lines 19-28:

A note 1014 may contain sub-notes 1016 that are linked to portions 1022 of a single Web page 1020, or multiple Web pages 1020. These Web pages 1020 may be associated with a single application 512, or with multiple applications 512. For example, note 1014A includes sub-notes 1016A, 1016B, 1016C that are linked to portions 1022A, 1022C, 1022B, respectively, of Web pages 1020A, 1020B that are associated with application 512A. Note 1014A also includes a sub-note 1016D that is linked to portion 1022D of object 1020C associated with application 512B.

Applicants concede that the cited passage deals with associating data parts with multiple applications. However, *Rivette* discusses the different data parts of web pages that may be associated and manipulated with multiple applications. In contrast, the claimed invention associates that the different data parts may arise from different applications. Additionally, Examiner argues the same rationale as in claim 1, which has now incorporated claim 3 by amendment regarding the ability to view the annotations from multiple applications. As stated above, *Rivette* does not teach that annotations may be viewed from multiple types of applications. Therefore, Applicants submit claim 25 and its dependents are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Regarding claim 30, which has been incorporated by amendment into claim 28, Examiner argues that it teaches the same as claim 13, which has been incorporated by amendment into claim 12. As stated above, *Rivette* does not teach that annotations may be viewed by multiple types of applications. Therefore, Applicants submit claim 30 and its dependents are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rivette* and further in view of *Barger* *et al.* (U.S. Publication 2004/0205542, hereinafter, "*Barger*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

This claim depends, directly or indirectly, from claim 15, which Applicants submit is allowable for reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants submit these claims are also allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Randol W. Read, Reg. No. 43,876/

Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)